Education Insights

Article

Teaching Reform of the Career Planning Course for University Students: Dilemmas, Pathways, and Implementation Strategies

Xueyin Shi[1,*]

[1] School of Electronics and Information Engineering, Wuyi University, Jiangmen, 529020, China
* Correspondence: Xueyin Shi, School of Electronics and Information Engineering, Wuyi University, Jiangmen, 529020, China

Abstract: The career planning course serves as a critical bridge linking talent cultivation to workforce demands, yet its current instructional frameworks have frequently failed to keep pace with the rapid structural transformation of modern employment. Drawing on recent scholarship and documented institutional practices, this comprehensive study identifies five persistent dilemmas in contemporary course delivery. These challenges include non-specialized faculty, overly generic content, monotonous lecturing methodologies, scarce experiential learning opportunities, and one-dimensional evaluation metrics. To address these systemic issues, corresponding instructional optimization pathways are proposed, all of which can be effectively implemented utilizing existing institutional resources. Specifically, the study advocates for outcome-based tiered curriculum design seamlessly integrated with professional education, alongside dynamic content renewal driven by school-based employment data and active alumni resources. Furthermore, the integration of immersive and competition-driven pedagogy, tiered personalized student support, pluralistic process-oriented evaluation systems, and sustained faculty development programs are highly recommended. The analysis ultimately suggests that sustainable educational transformation depends fundamentally on the systematic coordination and holistic integration of these multifaceted measures, rather than relying on any isolated intervention. By adopting this comprehensive approach, universities can significantly enhance the efficacy of their career planning programs and better prepare students for the complexities of the contemporary job market. This strategic alignment not only improves graduate employability but also fosters long-term institutional adaptability in an increasingly competitive global educational landscape.

Keywords: career planning; higher education; curriculum design; outcome-based education; employment guidance

Received: 12 September 2026
Revised: 01 November 2026
Accepted: 15 November 2026
Published: 22 November 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Rapid technological advancement and the sustained growth in graduate enrollment have significantly reshaped the higher education landscape, particularly in how institutions equip students with competencies relevant to evolving labor market demands. Projections indicate that automation and artificial intelligence will substantially reconfigure occupational structures globally over the coming decade, potentially displacing hundreds of millions of routine-based roles while simultaneously generating new categories of work requiring interdisciplinary knowledge, adaptive learning capabilities, and digital fluency. This dynamic environment places heightened emphasis on proactive career development support within academic curricula, as students must navigate increasing uncertainty in employment pathways and continuously recalibrate their skill portfolios throughout their professional lives [1].

Within this context, career planning instruction constitutes an integral part of the institutional framework for student development and employment readiness. Designed to foster self-awareness, clarify vocational interests, align academic choices with long-

term professional goals, and strengthen practical competencies through experiential learning, such instruction aims to bridge the gap between formal education and workplace expectations [2, 3]. It supports students in identifying suitable internship opportunities, cultivating transferable skills such as communication, teamwork, and problem-solving, and developing personalized strategies for job search, application, and interview preparation. The course further encourages reflective practice, enabling learners to assess their strengths, values, and developmental needs in relation to diverse industry contexts and organizational cultures.

Despite its intended significance, empirical evidence suggests persistent challenges in the implementation and perceived relevance of career planning instruction. Multiple evaluations reveal recurring concerns: course content often lacks sufficient discipline-specific anchoring, limiting its applicability for students in specialized fields; pedagogical approaches remain predominantly lecture-based, offering limited scope for active participation or real-world simulation; assessment methods frequently prioritize theoretical comprehension over demonstrable competency acquisition; and structural constraints—such as limited coordination with industry partners, infrequent employer engagement, and scarce access to alumni mentoring networks—undermine experiential dimensions critical to authentic career learning. These interrelated issues collectively contribute to diminished student motivation, shallow engagement, and suboptimal outcomes in terms of career clarity and employment readiness. Addressing these challenges requires a systemic perspective that integrates curriculum design, teaching methodology, stakeholder collaboration, and continuous evaluation mechanisms into a cohesive, evidence-informed enhancement strategy [4, 5].

2. The Necessity of Teaching Reform

2.1. Responding to the Employment-First Policy Orientation

Contemporary Chinese education policy emphasizes the prioritization of employment outcomes and the advancement of high-quality, comprehensive employment opportunities [6]. As primary institutions for cultivating professional talent, universities bear significant responsibility in aligning curricular design with national development goals and societal needs. Within this framework, career development education serves a distinctive and indispensable role. Unlike other academic courses—where engagement with workforce expectations tends to be indirect, fragmented, or incidental—the career development course provides students with sustained, systematic, and pedagogically guided exposure to evolving occupational landscapes, industry competency requirements, and institutional support mechanisms. This structured interface enables learners to progressively build self-awareness, explore vocational pathways, develop practical job-search competencies, and internalize ethical professional conduct [7]. When such a course fails to adapt dynamically to shifts in economic structure, technological advancement, and labor market demands, its capacity to serve as an effective bridge between academic learning and real-world application diminishes substantially. Consequently, curriculum enhancement is not merely an internal academic consideration but a necessary response to ensure continued relevance, responsiveness, and effectiveness in fulfilling institutional missions. Such enhancements involve iterative evaluation of learning objectives, instructional methods, assessment strategies, and stakeholder engagement practices to sustain alignment with both educational quality standards and broader socioeconomic imperatives.

2.2. Promoting Student Development and Academic Ethos

The career planning course serves as a foundational academic intervention that significantly contributes to holistic student development and the cultivation of a rigorous, purpose-driven academic ethos [8]. When thoughtfully designed and effectively delivered, this course enables students to articulate concrete learning goals aligned with their disciplinary pathways, thereby enhancing motivation, self-regulation, and sustained intellectual engagement. Such clarity in academic purpose fosters deeper integration

between curricular study and real-world professional expectations, creating a mutually reinforcing dynamic: heightened academic commitment strengthens vocational readiness, while exposure to authentic labor-market demands refines scholarly focus and methodological discipline. For higher education institutions, the course represents a strategically early, resource-efficient, and scalable mechanism for elevating graduate employment outcomes—measured not only by placement rates but also by job relevance, career progression, and long-term professional satisfaction. Its impact extends beyond individual students to institutional quality assurance frameworks, where graduate employability functions as a key performance metric reflecting curriculum responsiveness, pedagogical effectiveness, and alignment with national socioeconomic development priorities. Moreover, longitudinal implementation supports data-informed curriculum refinement and strengthens university-industry collaboration through structured internship pipelines, employer feedback loops, and competency-based learning design.

2.3. Aligning Talent Cultivation with Labor-Market Demand

This section underscores the imperative to recalibrate higher education outcomes with evolving economic and industrial requirements. A persistent misalignment has emerged between the competencies cultivated within academic programs and the functional capabilities demanded by contemporary sectors, including advanced manufacturing, digital services, green energy, and intelligent healthcare. Empirical evidence indicates that while some disciplines produce significantly more graduates than market absorption capacity permits, others—particularly those requiring interdisciplinary integration, applied technical proficiency, or domain-specific digital literacy—experience pronounced talent deficits. Furthermore, many students lack clear understanding of occupational pathways, encounter limited exposure to real-world work environments during their studies, and demonstrate insufficient adaptability when transitioning into dynamic professional settings. These challenges are compounded by curricular inertia, infrequent industry-academia collaboration in program design, and underdeveloped mechanisms for continuous labor-market intelligence gathering and responsive curriculum updating. Strengthening alignment thus requires systemic enhancements in career guidance infrastructure, experiential learning integration, employer engagement frameworks, and data-informed program evaluation protocols.

3. Persistent Dilemmas in Current Course Instruction

3.1. Insufficient and Non-Specialized Faculty

Faculty capacity constitutes the foundational pillar of effective course delivery, and this dimension represents a critical vulnerability in the current implementation of career planning instruction across higher education institutions. Empirical observation consistently reveals that instructional responsibilities are predominantly assigned to frontline student counselors and administrative personnel rather than to full-time academic staff possessing formal qualifications in career development theory, labor market analysis, or vocational pedagogy. This staffing pattern reflects structural constraints in institutional human resource allocation rather than pedagogical intentionality, resulting in a persistent misalignment between course objectives and instructor expertise.

Although counselors possess valuable contextual knowledge regarding individual student backgrounds, psychosocial development, and campus support systems, they typically receive minimal formal preparation in evidence-based career theories—such as social cognitive career theory, planned happenstance, or occupational choice models—as well as limited exposure to sector-specific labor market intelligence aligned with students' academic disciplines. Concurrently, their substantial administrative duties—including case management, policy compliance reporting, and crisis response—severely constrain time available for curriculum design, resource curation, and reflective teaching practice. Meanwhile, subject-matter faculty members, while deeply knowledgeable in their disciplinary domains, often lack training in career pedagogy, assessment strategies for

employability competencies, or methods for integrating discipline-specific career pathways into course content. Furthermore, regional universities and institutions outside first-tier cities face pronounced challenges in attracting and retaining certified career development professionals due to geographic isolation, limited professional development infrastructure, and comparatively constrained budgetary allocations [4]. Consequently, instruction frequently defaults to decontextualized, procedural skill-building—such as standardized résumé templates and rehearsed interview responses—without meaningful integration of academic discipline, industry evolution, or longitudinal career identity formation.

3.2. Generic Content Detached from Professional and Market Realities

Course content frequently relies on standardized textbooks that undergo infrequent revision, resulting in significant temporal lag between pedagogical materials and dynamic socioeconomic developments [9]. This delay impedes timely integration of knowledge related to newly emerging industries—such as intelligent manufacturing, green energy systems, and digital health services—as well as evolving national employment policies, regional industrial upgrading strategies, and authoritative industry reports published by governmental statistical agencies and sectoral research institutes. Moreover, curricular design often fails to establish meaningful linkages with students' declared academic disciplines, leading to a pronounced disconnect between theoretical instruction and discipline-specific professional competencies. There is limited incorporation of empirically grounded insights into sectoral labor demand trends, projected growth trajectories for key occupational categories within each field, and longitudinal career progression patterns observed among alumni—data routinely collected by university career development centers and higher education quality monitoring platforms. Consequently, students remain inadequately informed about the concrete occupational outcomes associated with their chosen major, undermining informed decision-making regarding skill acquisition, internship selection, and long-term career planning.

When instructional case studies are confined to generic, decontextualized textbook illustrations—and seldom anchored in the strategic industrial clusters of the host region, such as advanced equipment manufacturing in the Yangtze River Delta or new-materials development in the Guangdong–Hong Kong–Macao Greater Bay Area—they forfeit both disciplinary authenticity and applied relevance [7]. Such abstraction weakens conceptual anchoring, hampers transferability of learning to real-world problem-solving contexts, and diminishes students' perception of curriculum utility. Furthermore, the absence of discipline-integrated cases prevents learners from recognizing how foundational theories manifest in contemporary engineering practices, clinical protocols, financial regulatory frameworks, or educational policy implementation—thereby constraining the development of integrative thinking and professional identity formation. Empirical evidence from institutional teaching evaluations consistently indicates that pedagogical materials aligned with local economic priorities and students' academic specializations significantly enhance engagement, retention, and perceived value of coursework.

3.3. Monotonous Methodology

Teaching methodologies in current practice continue to rely heavily on traditional lecture-based instruction, with limited integration of pedagogically diverse and student-centered approaches. Situational teaching, experiential learning, structured group discussion, systematic case analysis, and professionally oriented activities such as simulated interviews remain underutilized and inconsistently implemented across institutions. This methodological inertia is further exacerbated by the widespread adoption of large-class formats, which inherently constrain opportunities for meaningful teacher–student interaction, real-time formative feedback, and dynamic classroom engagement. Moreover, the predominance of uniform, standardized lecturing fails to accommodate the substantial heterogeneity among learners—differences that span academic background, vocational interests, personal values, cognitive styles, and long-term career aspirations. Consequently, instructors face significant challenges in delivering

timely, differentiated feedback on both academic assessments and individualized career development planning. Such limitations hinder the cultivation of critical thinking, self-directed learning competencies, and professional identity formation—core objectives outlined in national higher education quality standards. Enhancing methodological flexibility, promoting evidence-informed instructional design, and supporting faculty development in active learning strategies are therefore essential priorities for sustained pedagogical improvement.

3.4. Scarce Experiential Learning

Career planning is inherently an applied discipline that requires direct engagement with real-world professional contexts; however, its experiential dimension remains significantly underdeveloped across most higher education institutions [10]. Structural constraints—including rigid curriculum scheduling, limited instructional staffing, insufficient career development funding, and inadequate access to external industry infrastructure—collectively restrict students' exposure to authentic workplace environments. As a result, learners seldom have opportunities to conduct field-based investigations into evolving industry landscapes, sector-specific labor market trends, occupational role expectations, or the day-to-day responsibilities associated with target professions. This persistent gap between theoretical instruction and lived occupational experience leads to highly generalized, decontextualized, and often inaccurate occupational awareness, which undermines the effectiveness of long-term career decision-making and self-efficacy development.

Instructional activities such as résumé writing guidance and interview preparation are frequently delivered through large-group classroom simulations or instructor-led modeling exercises, lacking sufficient individualized feedback and contextual authenticity. Moreover, collaboration with seasoned human resources professionals—whose insights reflect current hiring standards, competency frameworks, and organizational selection practices—is infrequent and typically ad hoc. Consequently, students rarely gain exposure to up-to-date recruitment protocols, behavioral assessment criteria, digital application systems, or employer expectations regarding soft skills and cultural fit. The absence of sustained, institutionally supported practice platforms—such as internships with structured learning outcomes, employer-mentored projects, or integrated work-integrated learning modules—further impedes the translation of conceptual knowledge into demonstrable occupational competence, adaptive problem-solving abilities, and professional identity formation.

3.5. One-Dimensional Evaluation

Finally, the evaluation system exhibits structural imbalances that inadvertently reinforce misaligned learning outcomes. Current assessment practices predominantly assign disproportionate weight to summative measures—particularly final written examinations and static career development documents—thereby privileging rote memorization and theoretical articulation over authentic career planning competencies, applied problem-solving abilities, reflective self-awareness, and adaptive professional judgment. This overreliance on decontextualized outputs fails to capture longitudinal growth, experiential learning integration, or the iterative nature of vocational identity formation. Moreover, such assessments rarely incorporate real-world constraints, stakeholder input, or scenario-based challenges that mirror actual workplace demands, thereby limiting their ecological validity and developmental utility for students preparing for dynamic labor markets.

The assessment system further suffers from a narrow evaluative ecology, relying almost exclusively on instructor-led evaluation without meaningful integration of complementary perspectives. Self-assessment opportunities remain underdeveloped and often lack structured rubrics or guided reflection protocols; peer assessment is infrequent and inconsistently implemented across courses; and feedback from external stakeholders—including employers, industry mentors, and alumni—is largely absent from formal evaluation frameworks. This monolithic approach significantly compromises

both the objectivity of performance judgments and the formative potential of assessment. Without robust, multi-source feedback loops, students are unable to monitor skill acquisition trajectories, identify competency gaps, or calibrate personal development goals. Simultaneously, educators lack timely, granular evidence to inform pedagogical refinements, curriculum adjustments, or targeted instructional interventions, ultimately weakening the responsiveness and effectiveness of the entire teaching–learning–assessment cycle.

4. Reform Pathways

4.1. Outcome-Oriented, Tiered Curriculum Integrated with Professional Education

The first pathway centers on a systematic reconfiguration of curriculum design to prioritize verifiable, observable, and measurable learning outcomes as the foundational anchor for all academic planning. This outcome-oriented approach necessitates that course objectives be articulated with precision prior to content selection, pedagogical strategy, or assessment design—ensuring that every instructional element is deliberately aligned and coherently scaffolded to support the attainment of those defined competencies. Rather than beginning with traditional subject coverage or disciplinary conventions, educators are encouraged to adopt a reverse-engineering logic: starting from the demonstrable capabilities graduates must possess upon completion, then designing learning experiences, sequencing knowledge acquisition, and calibrating evaluation methods accordingly. Such an approach fosters greater transparency for students, enhances accountability in teaching practice, and strengthens the alignment between academic preparation and real-world professional expectations across diverse sectors [11, 12].

To ensure responsiveness and granularity, universities should implement a tiered objective framework comprising three interdependent levels: a university-wide graduate attribute profile representing broad intellectual, ethical, and civic capacities; discipline-specific sub-goals reflecting core epistemic and methodological commitments of each field; and concrete, behaviorally anchored competency indicators tailored to individual majors. These indicators must be empirically grounded—not derived solely from faculty consensus—but informed by longitudinal alumni career trajectory analyses, structured employer feedback surveys, industry competency frameworks, and labor market intelligence reports. Each indicator should be formulated using action verbs (e.g., 'analyze', 'design', 'evaluate', 'collaborate') and specify context, scope, and performance criteria to enable reliable assessment through rubrics, portfolios, capstone projects, or authentic workplace simulations [13].

Curricular differentiation across the undergraduate timeline is essential to support holistic student development. First-year instruction should integrate structured career awareness activities—including reflective self-assessment tools, exploratory internships, and interdisciplinary seminars—to help students situate their interests, values, and strengths within broader societal and occupational contexts. Second-year programming must deepen occupational exploration through sector-specific case studies, practitioner-led workshops, and guided decision-making frameworks that clarify pathways among academic specializations, dual degrees, and emerging interdisciplinary fields. In the final two years, curricula should emphasize applied readiness: integrating labor market analytics, digital portfolio development, negotiation training, inclusive hiring practices, and adaptive job-search strategies responsive to evolving economic conditions and technological disruption—thereby equipping students not only for initial employment but also for lifelong professional agility and growth [14].

4.2. Dynamic Content Renewal Supported by School-Based Data and Alumni Resources

Effective curriculum development must be grounded in authentic, student-centered inquiry—responding directly to the questions learners raise about relevance, applicability, and future pathways. Two highly accessible, institutionally embedded resources significantly strengthen this alignment: school-based career intelligence systems and

structured alumni engagement frameworks. School-based career databases integrate longitudinal employment outcomes by academic program, detailed alumni career progression maps, and real-time analyses of regional industry talent gaps; such localized data serve as concrete anchors that bridge theoretical knowledge with professional practice. Empirical classroom observations confirm that students demonstrate heightened analytical engagement and sustained discussion when interpreting discipline-specific, geographically proximate labor market patterns rather than generalized national aggregates. Equally valuable is the pedagogical contribution of alumni narratives: individuals who have navigated the transition from academic study to workplace roles provide nuanced, context-rich perspectives on occupational identity formation, skill application, and adaptive learning. Their reflections—including candid accounts of iterative career decisions, interdisciplinary pivots, and contextual constraints—offer more pedagogically resonant models than idealized, linear success stories. A well-organized, searchable digital repository of alumni career profiles—categorized by sector, functional role, and geographic location—and systematically updated each academic cycle transforms lived experience into reusable instructional material. Furthermore, targeted short instructional modules on emerging and regionally prioritized industries extend this approach, drawing annually refreshed case examples from official local employment bulletins, industry cluster reports, and direct input from strategic employer partners engaged in curriculum advisory functions [15].

4.3. Immersive and Competition-Driven Pedagogy

Pedagogical innovation in career education emphasizes experiential learning grounded in authentic professional contexts. In this walk-based career planning course, students engage in structured site visits to enterprises founded or led by alumni, enabling direct observation of workplace culture, organizational routines, and role-specific responsibilities across diverse sectors. Each visit is scaffolded with preparatory briefings, guided reflection protocols, and post-visit synthesis activities to reinforce conceptual linkages between academic knowledge and occupational realities. Students conduct semi-structured interviews with practitioners, analyze occupational trajectories, and collaboratively design micro-projects aligned with real-world challenges identified during field engagement. This integration of theory, situated practice, and personalized career reflection fosters metacognitive awareness and strengthens self-efficacy in decision-making. To further deepen learning outcomes, competitive elements are thoughtfully embedded—not as extrinsic motivators alone, but as formative assessment mechanisms. Career planning contests require students to apply standardized assessment tools, articulate coherent development pathways, and defend strategic choices before panels of industry professionals. Similarly, simulated recruitment exercises replicate key stages of hiring processes, including application screening, competency-based interviews, and group assessments, thereby cultivating resilience, communication agility, and professional presence. Practitioner mentoring—through iterative feedback on draft plans—and sustained team-based project work further enrich the pedagogical architecture, ensuring alignment with evolving labor market expectations and graduate capability frameworks [16].

4.4. Tiered Personalized Support for Heterogeneous Needs

Support systems are most effectively reconfigured as a tiered, scalable network that leverages existing institutional capacity—rather than requiring new infrastructure or specialized staffing—thereby ensuring sustainability and broad accessibility across diverse academic units. A structured pre-term needs-assessment questionnaire serves as the foundational triage mechanism, systematically mapping student concerns along two empirically grounded dimensions: the temporal stage of academic planning (e.g., early exploration versus imminent decision-making) and the perceived complexity or emotional weight of the challenge (e.g., uncertainty about career pathways, conflicting familial expectations, or interdisciplinary identity formation). This dual-axis classification enables precise allocation to appropriately resourced interventions. Thematic group

counseling—facilitated by trained academic advisors or peer-support coordinators—addresses shared developmental challenges such as navigating the postgraduate application process, evaluating employment opportunities in volatile labor markets, or reconciling personal values with professional aspirations; these sessions integrate evidence-informed pedagogical strategies and are embedded within regular class time or scheduled academic advising blocks to minimize logistical barriers. Individualized counseling remains reserved for students confronting high-stakes, time-sensitive decisions—such as accepting an international scholarship offer or managing significant mental health–academic intersections—or those whose persistent uncertainty signals deeper systemic or psychosocial barriers. Crucially, final-year students who have recently secured graduate placements or full-time positions serve as rigorously trained peer mentors within their respective disciplines, offering contextually grounded guidance rooted in lived experience, thereby enhancing credibility, relatability, and program scalability without additional budgetary outlay. This architecture ensures equitable coverage, appropriate depth of engagement, and optimal utilization of human, temporal, and organizational resources already present within the university ecosystem [17].

4.5. Pluralistic, Process-Oriented Evaluation and Continuous Improvement

Evaluation frameworks in higher education benefit significantly from a comprehensive, multi-dimensional approach that integrates diverse perspectives, broadens assessment criteria beyond traditional metrics, and embeds feedback into iterative curriculum refinement. First, the evaluative authority should be distributed across multiple stakeholders: while faculty assessment of conceptual understanding remains essential, it must be balanced by structured student self-reflection, calibrated peer evaluation, and authentic input from external constituencies—including employers and alumni—regarding graduates' real-world performance, adaptability, and professional readiness. Second, the scope of assessment must extend well beyond summative examination scores; it should systematically capture practical competencies such as applied problem-solving, ethical decision-making, collaborative project execution, digital literacy, and creative solution generation—all measured longitudinally across learning sequences rather than isolated points in time. Third, and most critically, evaluation outcomes must feed directly into evidence-informed enhancement cycles: tracking graduate employment trajectories, job satisfaction, career progression, and employer-reported skill gaps over one to two years post-graduation provides empirically grounded insights for revising program aims, updating course content, refining pedagogical strategies, and strengthening industry alignment. Without this closed-loop mechanism, claims of continuous improvement risk remaining aspirational rather than operational [18].

4.6. Faculty Development and Coordinated Educational Forces

All preceding pathways fundamentally depend on the availability of a well-qualified, adequately resourced faculty. Universities are therefore encouraged to strategically increase the number of funded permanent academic and professional positions dedicated specifically to career guidance and development within university career service centers. Concurrently, institutions should broaden the career advancement trajectories available to these professionals through formalized promotion criteria, research support, and leadership opportunities. To enrich instructional quality and real-world relevance, universities should systematically integrate industry practitioners—including certified career development professionals, human resource specialists, and senior technical experts—into teaching teams via structured expert databases, formalized industry mentorship programs, and collaborative curriculum design initiatives. Regular collective lesson planning sessions, peer observation frameworks, and discipline-specific pedagogical seminars should be institutionalized to foster continuous improvement in teaching practice and ensure alignment with evolving labor market demands and national educational priorities [19].

Currently, many counseling and administrative staff members assume substantial teaching responsibilities related to career education without corresponding foundational training in career development theory, psychometric assessment methodologies, or evidence-informed intervention strategies. To address this gap, universities must implement mandatory, competency-based professional development programs that cover core domains such as occupational psychology, labor market analysis, ethical counseling practice, and digital career tools. These programs should be complemented by workload recognition mechanisms—such as formal teaching credit allocation, performance-based stipends, or inclusion in promotion portfolios—to incentivize sustained engagement. Over time, such structured support enables part-time and non-specialist instructors to progressively attain recognized expertise, thereby strengthening the overall capacity and credibility of career education delivery across the institution [20].

Effective coordination among diverse educational stakeholders is essential for delivering integrated, high-impact career development experiences. Counselors, subject-matter faculty, enterprise-based mentors, and distinguished alumni each bring distinct yet complementary perspectives and practical insights [1]. Their purposeful collaboration—facilitated through jointly designed employment readiness workshops, cross-role mentoring circles, and shared learning outcomes mapping—transforms traditionally isolated guidance activities into a unified, institution-wide educational support ecosystem. Furthermore, curriculum integration must extend beyond skill acquisition to include value-oriented dimensions: course content across disciplines should explicitly connect vocational decision-making with broader societal contributions, civic responsibility, and sustainable development goals—particularly highlighting meaningful engagement in public service, rural revitalization initiatives, community-based enterprises, and other socially impactful employment pathways aligned with national development strategies.

5. Conclusion

The career planning course occupies a pivotal role in aligning educational objectives with evolving professional landscapes, serving as a critical bridge between academic preparation and post-graduation occupational engagement. Its continuous refinement constitutes a sustained, multi-layered effort grounded in pedagogical coherence, institutional responsiveness, and learner-centered design—rather than episodic or ad hoc modifications. Persistent challenges—including instructors without dedicated expertise in career development, curriculum content that lacks contextual relevance to current industry expectations, instructional approaches characterized by passive transmission rather than active construction of knowledge, insufficient integration of real-world experiential learning opportunities, and assessment frameworks that prioritize summative outcomes over developmental progress—are not isolated phenomena. Instead, they interact dynamically, reinforcing one another and collectively undermining the course's capacity to foster meaningful self-awareness, strategic decision-making, and adaptive career agency among students. Addressing any single dimension in isolation has consistently yielded only transient improvements, underscoring the necessity for an integrated, systemic approach grounded in evidence-informed practice and longitudinal implementation.

Accordingly, the proposed framework advances six interdependent dimensions designed to function synergistically: (1) outcome-oriented tiered design establishes clear, progressively scaffolded competencies aligned with diverse student aspirations and developmental stages; (2) school-based data analytics—drawing on institutional enrollment patterns, graduate destination tracking, and alumni career trajectory surveys—ensures curricular relevance and responsiveness; (3) immersive pedagogical strategies—including simulations, employer-led workshops, and competition-integrated projects—cultivate applied judgment and professional identity; (4) tiered personalized support mechanisms differentiate assistance by student need, readiness, and aspiration level, extending beyond classroom instruction into mentoring, portfolio development,

and individualized coaching; (5) pluralistic process evaluation employs multiple modalities—reflective journals, iterative feedback loops, peer review, and competency-based rubrics—to capture growth across cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains; and (6) sustained faculty development initiatives build instructor capacity in both career theory and experiential facilitation, ensuring fidelity and adaptability in delivery. Together, these elements constitute a robust, scalable architecture for enduring enhancement of career planning education.

References

1. McKinsey Global Institute, *Jobs Lost, Jobs Gained: Workforce Transitions in a Time of Automation*, New York, NY, USA: McKinsey & Company, 2017.
2. J. Manyika et al., "Jobs lost, jobs gained: Workforce transitions in a time of automation," *McKinsey Global Institute*, vol. 150, no. 1, pp. 1–148, 2017.
3. A. Kumar, Personal, Academic and Career Development in Higher Education: SOARing to Success. Routledge, 2009.
4. M. Mo, "Teaching Reform and Practical Exploration of the Career Planning Course for University Students, " *Journal of Jiamusi Vocational Institute*, no. 5, pp. 145–147, 2025.
5. D. Jackson and M. Tomlinson, "Career values and proactive career behaviour among contemporary higher education students," *Journal of Education and Work*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 449–464, 2019.
6. X. Wang, "Research on the Teaching Reform of the Career Planning Course for University Students from the Perspective of Employment Priority," *Employment and Security*, no. 4, pp. 55–57, 2025.
7. D. Jackson and M. Tomlinson, "Investigating the relationship between career planning, proactivity and employability perceptions among higher education students in uncertain labour market conditions," *Higher Education*, vol. 80, no. 3, pp. 435–455, 2020.
8. K. Purcell et al., "Applying for Higher Education–the diversity of career choices, plans and expectations," Department for Education, London, Mar. 2008.
9. J. S. Stephen, "Career planning, professional development, and lifelong learning," in *Academic Success in Online Programs: A Resource for College Students*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024, pp. 199–212.
10. Z. Peng and D. A. Ali, "LEADERSHIP AND CAREER PLANNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THEIR IMPACT ON STUDENT SUCCESS," *Cosmos: An International Journal of Management*, vol. 14, no. 2, p. 32, 2025.
11. S. Tomy and E. Pardede, "Map my career: Career planning tool to improve student satisfaction," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 132950–132965, 2019.
12. J. Shury, D. Vivian, C. Turner, and C. Downing, *Planning for Success: Graduates' Career Planning and Its Effect on Graduate Outcomes*. London: Department for Education, 2017.
13. U. C. Okolie et al., "Career training with mentoring programs in higher education: Facilitating career development and employability of graduates," *Education + Training*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 214–234, 2020.
14. H. Li, "Practical Research on Curriculum Reform in College Students' Career Planning Driven by the 'Three-Chain Integration' Framework," *Journal of Science and Education*, no. 11, pp. 91–94, 2026.
15. Y. Zhang, "Path of career planning and employment strategy based on deep learning in the information age," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 19, no. 10, p. e0308654, 2024.
16. R. Sepahvand, Z. Solgi, and F. Akbaripasham, "The impact of orientation and planning of varied career orientation on employability of graduates in higher Education," *Quarterly Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 71–90, 2023.
17. G. Nabi, A. Walmsley, M. Mir, and S. Osman, "The impact of mentoring in higher education on student career development: a systematic review and research agenda," *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 739–755, 2025.
18. K. Zuo, "Understanding motivation, career planning, and socio-cultural adaptation difficulties as determinants of higher education institution choice decision by international students in the post-pandemic era," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 13, p. 955234, 2022.
19. K. Betts, D. Urias, and K. Betts, "Higher education and shifting US demographics: Need for visible administrative career paths, professional development, succession planning & commitment to diversity," *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal (2003–2012)*, vol. 7, no. 2, p. 6, 2009.
20. D. H. Kinkel, "Engaging students in career planning and preparation through ementoring," *Journal of Natural Resources and Life Sciences Education*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 150–159, 2011.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Publisher and/or the editor(s). Publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.